



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/532,995

11/18/2005

Kiyoshi Yagi

Q87740

9113

65565 7590 06/11/2009  
SUGHRUE-265550  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

NERANGIS, VICKEY MARIE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/11/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Attachment to Advisory Action***

Applicants' amendment filed on 6/5/2009 has been fully considered; however, the amendment has not been entered given that it raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Specifically, claim 7 has been amended to be dependent on claim 5 and would necessitate a new grounds of rejection over claim 7. Therefore, the amendment would require further consideration and/or search. Because amendments are not entered in part, applicant's response filed 6/5/2009 has not been entered.

In the interest of better enabling the applicants to assess the patentability of their claims, the following advisory is given:

In response to applicant's request to clarify the reference to JP '570 in paragraph 5 of the Office action mailed on 2/9/2009, "JP '527" was inadvertently written in this paragraph and in each instance should be replaced with "JP '570".

In response to applicant's argument that there is no reason to combine JP '570 and Sham et al because JP '570 fails to disclose fire retardants and Sham et al fails to disclose polyamide fiber, it is the examiner's position that adding a suitable ingredient known to impart a desirable property to a composition would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Case law holds that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supports *prima facie* obviousness. *Sinclair & Carroll Co vs. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 US 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1045).

Application/Control Number: 10/532,995

Page 3

Art Unit: 1796

6/11/2009

vn

/Vickey Nerangis/

Examiner, Art Unit 1796